

## REMARKS

These Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 25, 2006. Claims 32, 33, 35-40 and 45-56 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

### I. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 32, 33, 35-40 and 45-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Clark et al., (hereinafter “Clark”), US Patent No. 6,317,797, in view of Boothby, US Patent No. 5,684,990, and in further view of Kaufman, US Patent No. 6,034,621.

As examiner noted in the Office Action on January 25, 2006, “neither Clark nor Boothby teaches synchronizing between two PCs at different locations” (page 4, first paragraph). The newly cited prior art of Kaufman teaches wireless remote synchronization of data between PC and PDA, not the synchronization between two PCs as claimed in the present invention. A handheld device like PDA is fundamentally different from a PC in at least in the following ways: processing capability, storage capacity, operating system, file management, network security management, access control, and complexity of software and hardware management. Consequently, the present invention of synchronization between two PCs requires totally distinctive technologies and methods compared to synchronization between a PDA and a PC as detailed in the application’s specification, and it is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the feature of Kaufman to the Clark-Boothby’s system. Therefore, Clark in view of Boothby and in further view of Kaufman cannot anticipate independent claims 32, 36, 39, and 45 of the present invention. Since claims 33 and 35 depend on claim 32, claims 37 and 38 depend on claim 36, claims 40 depends on claim 39, and claims 46-56 depend on claim 45, Clark in view of Boothby and in further view of Kaufman cannot render claims 32, 33, 35-40 and 45-56 obvious for at least this reason, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn.


## II. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/25/06

By:   
David T. Xue  
Reg. No. 54,554

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Customer No. 23910